

The second set of figures seems to support our case even more strongly than the first:

	Soviet (%)	Non-Soviet (%)	Total
<i>Laspeyresia</i>			
anywhere	74 (9.9)	671 (90.1)	745
in title	41 (15.8)	218 (84.2)	259
<i>Cydia</i>			
anywhere	253 (14.6)	1480 (85.4)	1733
in title	5 (3.3)	145 (96.7)	150
<i>Laspeyresia</i> and/or <i>Cydia</i>			
anywhere	254 (14.6)	1482 (85.4)	1736
in title	44 (11.1)	353 (88.9)	397
<i>Laspeyresia</i> and <i>Cydia</i>			
anywhere	73 (9.8)	669 (90.2)	742
in title	2 (16.7)	10 (83.3)	12
<i>Laspeyresia</i> not <i>Cydia</i>			
anywhere	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	3
in title	39 (15.8)	208 (84.2)	247
<i>Cydia</i> not <i>Laspeyresia</i>			
anywhere	180 (18.2)	811 (81.8)	991
in title	3 (2.2)	135 (97.8)	138

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *HYLA LACTEA*
DAUDIN, 1803 (AMPHIBIA). Z.N.(S.)2341
(see Vol. 41, pp. 122–124)

By Hobart M. Smith (*EPOB, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309, U.S.A.*)

Despite Stimson's (Vol. 42, pp. 6–7) arguments to the contrary, a reasonable case exists for conservation of *Hyla lactea* Daudin, 1803. Stimson's case for suppression of *Hyla lactea* Laurenti, 1768, solely for purposes of the Principle of Priority, and not of Homonymy, appears to be premised upon a key objective of the Code to promote stability of nomenclature. Failure of suppression of *Hyla lactea* Laurenti, 1768, for purposes of the Principle of Homonymy, would eliminate Daudin's homonym, making its subjective junior synonym *Sphaenorhynchus eurhostus* Rivero, 1969 the valid name for the species. On the contrary, suppressing Laurenti's *Hyla lactea* for purposes of the Principle of Homonymy (as well as of Priority, to which Stimson agrees), as proposed by Lynch and Duellman, would leave it as a valid name, of which both *Hyla aurantiaca* Daudin, 1803, and *S. eurhostus* Rivero, 1969, are invalid subjective junior synonyms.

Although 'stability' is not and probably should not be explicitly defined in the Code, Art. 79c does imply that usage over a 50 year period is a criterion of stability. A name uncontested for that period of time, immediately prior to the present, is, in effect, a *nomen veneratum*, a concept not so named but clearly implicit (even though not adequately emphasised) in provisions (particularly Art. 79) of the Code. Nomina venerata are simply names used without contest for the immediately preceding 50 years; they are not automatically conserved, but, if presented, a case made for them to be conserved is assured of consideration by the Commission. Names with less than 50 years of uncontested use have no such assurance. In other words, stability is certainly a consideration for nomina venerata; it is not necessarily a consideration for names with lesser periods of uncontested usage.

Applying these thoughts to the present case, it is obvious that *S. eurhostus* has much less than the desirable 50 years of usage — no more than 16 — whereas *Hyla lactea* Daudin has been in existence for 182 years and has been accepted as valid intermittently throughout that time. It seems to me much more in the interest of stability to perpetuate that name than to conserve a 16-year-old one even if the latter has had more usage during its brief existence than the former.

Stimson also suggested that, in order to clear the way for retention of *Hyla hypocondrialis* Daudin, 1803, as a valid name, Lynch & Duellman should cite 10 publications by at least 5 different authors during the last 50 years wherein that name was accepted, conforming with Art. 79c of the Code. However, that article pertains to synonyms, whereas Lynch & Duellman made it clear that the older name *Hyla lactea* Laurenti, 1768, which has simply been ignored by herpetologists throughout its history, despite having been suggested as a synonym of *H. hypocondrialis* as early as 1803 (by Daudin), is a *nomen dubium* of uncertain allocation, and for that reason had justifiably been ignored. Therefore, the names *H. lactea* Laurenti, 1768, and *H. hypocondrialis* Daudin, 1803, are not synonyms, and the latter need not therefore be supported by explicit data on frequency of its use. Both petitions attest to the wide and current use of the name (in the combination *Phyllomedusa hypocondrialis*). However, it would be useful to conserve Daudin's name while these related matters are under consideration.

Accordingly, I recommend approval by the Commission of all of Lynch and Duellman's requests, and in addition that the following be considered:

- (5) placement of the specific name *hypocondrialis* as used in the combination *Hyla hypocondrialis* Daudin, 1803, p. 29, holotype lost, type-locality, 'Surinam', on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED GRANT OF PRECEDENCE TO
THRESKIORNITHIDAE RICHMOND, 1917 (AVES) OVER PLATALEINAE
BONAPARTE, 1838. Z.N.(S.)2136
(see vol. 41, pp. 240–244)

- (1) By Kenneth E. Campbell (*Natural History Museum, Los Angeles County, Los Angeles 90007, U.S.A.*)

I wish to record my strong opposition to the placement of THRESKIORNITHIDAE Richmond, 1917 on the Official List of Family–Group Names in Zoology in place of the widely recognised and long-used PLATALEINAE Bonaparte, 1838.